



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/690,796 | 10/17/2000 | Craig L. Ogg | 39477/RRT/S850 | 3181 |
| 23363 | 7590 | 03/28/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP | | | CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A | |
| PO BOX 7068 | | | ART UNIT | |
| PASADENA, CA 91109-7068 | | | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3621 | |
| DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/690,796 | OGG, CRAIG L. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Salvatore Cangialosi | 3621 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-10,17,22,42,50-52,55-59,61,92,107,108,110,113 and 114 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-10, 17, 22, 42, 50-52, 55-59, 61, 92, 107, 108, 110, 113, and 114 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/13/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3621

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1, 5-10, 17, 22, 42, 50-52, 55-59, 61, 92, 107, 108, 110, 113, and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Cordery et al (6466921) in view of Cordery et al (6957196) and Pierce et al (6151591) and Rosenzweig et al (6081810) and either Gupta et al (6226752) or Rosen (5621797).

Regarding claim 1, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose a means for secure online value printing including a server, secure database, and cryptographic module and password authentication substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention are the use of specific executable code and

Art Unit: 3621

plurality of modules. It is noted that the use of digital signatures in a digital environment to create a virtual method or system appears to be functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. It is also obvious to replicate existing structures as shown by the cryptographic modules 22 of Cordery et al (see 196, Fig 1, Col. 2 lines 45-55) controlled by a database. Pierce et al (See Figs. 1,2,4-7, Col. 6, lines 60-65, Col. 7, lines 10-25, and Cols 9 and 10) show password authentication and software code to execute same. Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cordery et al because resource manager intervening interfaces are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding the password limitations of claim 5, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations because if password authentication fails used a normally logged out (See Fig. 7 of Lee et al (5742683)). Regarding database limitations of claim 6, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing

Art Unit: 3621

including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison(See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding database limitations of claim 7, Cordery et al(See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison and ends transaction if comparison fails(See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding database limitations of claim 8, Cordery et al(See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison(See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding database backup limitations of claim 9, Rosenzweig et al(See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding database backup limitations of claim 10, Rosenzweig et al(See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup which are conventional functional equivalents

Art Unit: 3621

of the claim. Regarding updating limitations of claim 17, Cordery et al (See Fig. 3, Col. 9, lines 30-40 and 55-60 and claims 10-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including data freshness updating which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding error limitations of claim 22, it is obvious to include error correction in all digital systems especially cryptographic systems because of the irrecoverable data loss resulting from digital error. Regarding postal limitations of claim 42, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online postal printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding claim 50, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose a method for secure online value printing including a server, clients secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific executable code and updating a database. It is noted that the use of digital signatures in a digital environment to create a virtual method or system appears to be functionally equivalent to the claim

Art Unit: 3621

limitations. Cordery et al (see 196, Fig 1, Col. 2 lines 45-55) shows cryptographic modules 22 controlled by a database controlled by a database which updates meter records. Pierce et al (See Figs. 1,2,4-7, Col. 6, lines 60-65, Col. 7, lines 10-25, and Cols 9 and 10) show password authentication and software code to execute same. Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup. It is also noted that updating a database is a standard database function, otherwise resort can be had to either Gupta et al (Col. 11, lines 10-25, Col. 13, lines 20-30) or Rosen (Col. 13, lines 10-30, claims 13 and 16). It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cordery et al because resource manager intervening interfaces are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding cryptographic limitations of claim 51, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including record encryption which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding database limitations of claim 52, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password

Art Unit: 3621

authentication including database comparison(See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding database limitations of claim 55, Cordery et al(See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison(See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding database limitations of claim 56, Cordery et al(See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison and ends transaction if comparison fails(See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding database limitations of claim 57, Cordery et al(See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison(See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the

Art Unit: 3621

claim. Regarding database backup limitations of claim 58, Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding database backup limitations of claim 59, Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding plurality limitations of claim 61, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, **Col 7, lines 5-10**, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, one or more cryptographic modules and password authentication) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding claim 92, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose a means for secure online value printing including a server, secure database, and cryptographic module and password authentication substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific executable code and updating a database. It is noted that the use of digital signatures in a digital environment to create a virtual method or system appears to be functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Cordery et al (see 196, Fig 1, Col. 2 lines 45-55) shows cryptographic modules 22 controlled by a database controlled by a database which updates meter records.

Art Unit: 3621

Pierce et al (See Figs. 1,2,4-7, Col. 6, lines 60-65, Col. 7, lines 10-25, and Cols 9 and 10) show password authentication and software code to execute same. Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup. It is also noted that updating a database is a standard database function, otherwise resort can be had to either Gupta et al (Col. 11, lines 10-25, Col. 13, lines 20-30) or Rosen (Col. 13, lines 10-30, claims 13 and 16). It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cordery et al because resource manager intervening interfaces are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 107, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose a method for secure online value printing including a server, secure database, and cryptographic module and password authentication substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific executable code and updating a database. It is noted that the use of digital signatures in a digital environment to create a virtual method or system appears to be functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Cordery et al (see 196, Fig 1, Col. 2 lines 45-55) shows cryptographic modules 22 controlled by a database controlled by a database which updates meter records. Pierce et al (See Figs. 1,2,4-7, Col. 6, lines 60-65, Col. 7,

Art Unit: 3621

lines 10-25, and Cols 9 and 10) show password authentication and software code to execute same. Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup. It is also noted that updating a database is a standard database function; otherwise resort can be had to either Gupta et al (Col. 11, lines 10-25, Col. 13, lines 20-30) or Rosen (Col. 13, lines 10-30, claims 13 and 16). It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cordery et al because resource manager intervening interfaces are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding database backup limitations of claim 108, Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup, which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim because the function of backup is to provide recovery. Regarding database limitations of claim 110, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding database limitations of claim 113, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure

Art Unit: 3621

online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim. Regarding database prevention limitations of claim 114, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison and ends transaction if comparison fails (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Examiner's Note: Although Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant(s), the specified citations are merely representative of the teaching of the prior art that are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim and other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant(s), in preparing the response, fully consider the items of evidence in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Applicants arguments filed 1/13/06 are moot due the new

Serial Number: 09/690,796

12

Art Unit: 3621

grounds of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number (703) 305-1837. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 Am to 5:00 PM, Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached at (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to (571)273-8300

Hand delivered responses should be brought to

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

Serial Number: 09/690,796

13

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Salvatore C. Cingolani
SALVATORE CINGOLANI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222